

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6, 15, 19, 21, 25 and 30 were previously amended. Claims 1-32 remain in the application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

5

The Rejections

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over by U.S. Patent No. 6,807,388 to Kojima et al. (hereinafter "Kojima") in view of Publication No. 20040223177 to Takagi et al. (hereinafter "Takagi").

10

The Claims

Claim 1 recites a method of operating a printer comprising:

- 15 • monitoring content of one or more documents that are to be printed on a printer, said monitoring taking place within a printer that is to print the one or more documents;
- determining whether the monitored content is of interest to an organization of which the printer comprises a part;
- 20 • monitoring one or more variables or parameters associated with the security of the printer, wherein at least one of said variables or parameters is associated with I/O activities of data that is to be or has been printed on the printer; and
- generating a notification if the content is of interest to the organization.

25

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Kojima discloses all of the subject matter of the claim except for the second-recited act of monitoring. For this subject matter, the Office relies on Takagi and particularly, Fig. 5, paragraph 0064 and paragraph 0115. Specifically, the Office argues that

Takegi discloses the second-recited monitoring act and argues that Takagi discloses that a user name and password have to be applied to be able to get access to the private printing document lists. Thus, in the Office's view, the combination of these references would render the subject matter of this claim obvious because
5 of "the way they would be printed or deleted for the purpose of securing the environment of the printing." See, Office, Page 3.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. Preliminarily, Applicant submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least the reason that the Office's stated motivation does
10 not appear to make sense. Specifically, the excerpt quoted above -- "the way they would be printed or deleted for the purpose of securing the environment of the printing" -- does not appear to make sense. If the Office is arguing that the user name and password are printed -- Applicant disagrees. It does not appear that the user's name and password are printed. In fact, it seems quite logical that if the
15 user's name and password were to be printed, the very security of Takagi's system would be compromised.

Hence, based on this seemingly faulty and misplaced motivation to combine the references, the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

However, related to the subject matter of Takagi that forms the basis for the
20 Office's misplaced motivation is that fact that not all of the elements of this claim are found in both of the references.

Specifically, the feature of interest in the claim above recites as follows:

25 monitoring one or more variables or parameters associated with the security of the printer, wherein at least one of said variables or parameters is

associated with *I/O activities of data that is to be or has been printed on the printer*; and

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office appears to argue that
5 Takagi's user name and password somehow meets the subject matter of this claim.
If this is the case, then the Office is mistaken. Nowhere does Takagi disclose or
suggest that the user's name and password are to be or are printed on the printer.
In point of fact, there would appear to be a disincentive to do so insofar as doing
so would appear to jeopardize the security of Takagi's system. Specifically, if
10 Takagi's user name and password were to be printed, then there is a chance that
someone other than the user could retrieve the same from the printer and use it for
improper purposes.

Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, the Office has failed to
establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and this claim is allowable.

15 **Claims 2-5** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an
allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed
nor suggested in the references cited and applied by the Office.

Claim 6 recites a method of operating a printer comprising:

20

- providing a context-analyzer within a printer;
- receiving a data stream into the printer, the data stream representing a document that is to be printed by the printer;
- providing a data stream to the context-analyzer;
- 25 • analyzing the provided data stream with the context-analyzer to ascertain one or more contexts associated with the data stream; *and*
- *monitoring one or more variables or parameters associated with the security of the printer, wherein at least one of said variables or*

parameters is associated with I/O activities of data that is to be or has been printed on the printer.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same
5 argument that it made above with respect to claim 1. For the reasons stated above with regard to the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, this claim is allowable.

Claims 7-14 depend from claim 6 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
10 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 6, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references cited and applied by the Office.

Claim 15 recites a method of operating a printer comprising [added language appears in bold italics:

- 15 • defining a document profile;
- programming a context-analyzer with the document profile;
- providing the context-analyzer within a printer;
- receiving a data stream with the context-analyzer, the data stream being associated with a document that is to be printed by the printer;
- 20 • analyzing the data stream with the context-analyzer;
- determining whether the data stream meets the document profile within some degree of certainty; and
- 25 • *monitoring one or more variables or parameters associated with the security of the printer, wherein at least one of said variables or parameters is associated with I/O activities of data that is to be or has been printed on the printer.*

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same argument that it made above with respect to claim 1. For the reasons stated above

with regard to the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, this claim is allowable.

Claims 16-18 depend from claim 15 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 15, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references cited and applied by the Office.

Claim 19 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a printer, cause the printer to:

10

- monitor content of one or more documents that are to be printed on a printer;
- determine whether the monitored content is of interest to an organization;
- generate a notification if the content is of interest to the organization; *and*
- *monitor one or more variables or parameters associated with the security of the printer, wherein at least one of said variables or parameters is associated with I/O activities of data that is to be or has been printed on the printer.*

15

20

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same argument that it made above with respect to claim 1. For the reasons stated above with regard to the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, this claim is allowable.

25

Claim 20 depends from claim 19 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 19, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references cited and applied by the Office.

Claim 21 recites an apparatus comprising:

- at least one printer;
- a context-analyzer resident in said at least one printer and configured to monitor content of one or more documents that are to be printed on the printer and determine whether the content is of interest to an organization of which the printer comprises a part; *and*
- *a printer monitor associated with said at least one printer and configured to monitor one or more variables or parameters associated with the security of the printer, wherein at least one of said variables or parameters is associated with I/O activities of data that is to be or has been printed on the printer.*

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same argument that it made above with respect to claim 1. For the reasons stated above with regard to the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, this claim is allowable.

Claims 22-24 depend from claim 21 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 21, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references cited and applied by the Office.

Claim 25 recites an apparatus comprising:

- at least one printer;
- a context-analyzer resident in the printer and configured to:
 - receive a data stream within the printer, the data stream representing a document that is to be printed by the printer; *and*
 - analyze the data stream to ascertain one or more contexts associated with the data stream; *and*
- *a printer monitor associated with said at least one printer and configured to monitor one or more variables or parameters associated with the security of the printer, wherein at least one of*

said variables or parameters is associated with I/O activities of data that is to be or has been printed on the printer.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same argument that it made above with respect to claim 1. For the reasons stated above with regard to the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, this claim is allowable.

Claims 26-29 depend from claim 25 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 25, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references cited and applied by the Office.

Claim 30 recites an architecture comprising:

- one or more context-analyzers, each of which being configured to:
 - receive a data stream within a printer, the data stream representing a document that is to be printed by the printer; and
 - analyze the data stream to ascertain one or more contexts associated with the data stream; and
- ***a printer monitor associated with the printer and configured to monitor one or more variables or parameters associated with the security of the printer, wherein at least one of said variables or parameters is associated with I/O activities of data that is to be or has been printed on the printer.***

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office makes the same argument that it made above with respect to claim 1. For the reasons stated above with regard to the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, this claim is allowable.

Claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 31 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own

recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 31, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references cited and applied by the Office.

Conclusion

5 Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

10

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9/1/05

By: 

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605

15

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.